



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,847	11/30/2005	Fyodor Urnov	8325-0034 (S34-US1)	7879
20855	7590	06/05/2009		EXAMINER
ROBINS & PASTERNAK 1731 EMBARCADERO ROAD SUITE 230 PALO ALTO, CA 94303				SISSON, BRADLEY L
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
				MAIL DATE
				06/05/2009
				DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/533,847	URNOV ET AL.
	Examiner Bradley L. Sisson	Art Unit 1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 6-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 2-5 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2009 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/06/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 May 2009 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Claims 1 and 6-15 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 01 August 2007.

Drawings

3. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because:

- a. The lettering is not of proper size, uniform density, and well-defined in Figure(s) 4; and
- b. The lines are not clean, well-defined, and of uniform thickness in Figure(s) 4;

2. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

Replacement Drawing Sheets

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement sheets which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments section, or remarks, section of the amendment paper. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). A replacement sheet must include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and within the top margin.

Annotated Drawing Sheets

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheet(s) must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheet" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings MUST be filed within the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. As a result of amendment filed 26 May 2009, claims 2-5 are now limited to an array of polynucleotides sequences with "the polynucleotide sequences consisting of accessible regions of cellular chromatin." A review of the response fails to locate where applicant has indicated support for this limitation in the original disclosure. See MPEP 714.02 [R-3]. Further, a review of the original disclosure fails to find support for the newly-added limitation. Accordingly, the limitation that the only nucleic acids present on the array are those of accessible regions is deemed to constitute new matter.

6. As a result of amendment filed 26 May 2009, claims 2-5 are now limited to an array of polynucleotides sequences with "the polynucleotide sequences consisting of accessible regions of cellular chromatin." A review of the disclosure finds that a Sequence Listing was filed on 17

November 2005. Said Sequence Listing, however, has been found to comprise but a single sequence, and then the sequence depicted is that of 25 amino acids of an indeterminate composition, not of multiple nucleic acids that are derived from "accessible regions of cellular chromatin and are isolated based on their altered reactivity to probe of chromatin structure." For convenience, the sole disclosed sequence is reproduced below.

<400> SEQUENCE: 1
Cys Xaa Xaa Xaa Xaa Cys Xaa
1 5 10 15
Xaa Xaa His Xaa Xaa Xaa Xaa Xaa His
20 25

7. While the claimed invention is defined in terms of the process used to isolate it, and not in terms of its nucleotide structure, the specification similarly fails to describe the composition of the probe(s) that are used to isolate the members of the array.

8. As presently worded, the claimed array can comprise "available" nucleic acids that are derived from any life form as well as variants of same. In support of this position, attention is directed to page 8, last paragraph, of the specification, which states in part:

Unless otherwise indicated, a particular nucleic acid sequence also implicitly encompasses conservatively modified variants thereof (e.g., degenerate codon substitutions) and complementary sequences, as well as the sequence explicitly indicated.

9. A review of the disclosure fails to find where any array of any nucleic acids has been prepared, regardless of the accessibility of the nucleotide sequence.

10. For purposes of examination, the array of polynucleotide sequences has been construed as encompassing at the very least, two nucleic acids molecules. A review of the disclosure has fails to identify where applicant has prepared any array, including an array that has two nucleic acids molecules, be they accessible or not.

11. While the specification explicitly allows for the inclusion of variants, the specification has not been found to provide an adequate written description of those nucleic acid molecules that are useful versus those that are not.

12. The absence of an adequate written description for any such array does not reasonably suggest that applicant had possession of the array at the times of filing.

13. It appears that applicant is attempting to satisfy the written description requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, through obviousness. Obviousness, however, cannot be relied upon for satisfaction of the written description requirement. In support of this position, attention is directed to the decision in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* (Fed. Cir. 1997) 43 USPQ2d at 1405, citing *Lockwood v. American Airlines Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 1997) 41 USPQ2d at 1966:

Recently, we held that a description which renders obvious a claimed invention is not sufficient to satisfy the written description requirement of that invention.

14. For the above reasons, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

15. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

16. As set forth in *Enzo Biochem Inc., v. Calgene, Inc.* (CAFC, 1999) 52 USPQ2d at 1135, bridging to 1136:

To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without 'undue experimentation.' "Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, A/S, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Whether claims are sufficiently enabled by a disclosure in a specification is determined as of the date that the patent application was first filed, see *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986).... We have held that a patent specification complies with the statute even if a "reasonable" amount of routine experimentation is required in order to practice a claimed invention, but that such experimentation must not be "undue." See, e.g., *Wands*, 858 F.2d at 736-37, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 ("Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation . . . However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.'") (footnotes, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). In *In re Wands*, we set forth a number of factors which a court may consider in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors were set forth as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. *Id.* at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. We have also noted that all of the factors need not be reviewed when determining whether a disclosure is enabling. See *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., Ltd.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1213, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (noting that the *Wands* factors "are illustrative, not mandatory. What is relevant depends on the facts.").

The quantity of experimentation necessary

The quantity of experimentation necessary is great, on the order of several man-years, and then with little if any reasonable expectation of successfully enabling the full scope of the claims.

The amount of direction or guidance presented.

The amount of guidance provided is limited, generally prophetic, and not commensurate with the scope of the claims. The specification does not set forth any array, much less a method of using same.

The presence or absence of working examples

The specification comprises the following examples:

Example 1: Preparation of regulatory DNA library from HEK 293 cells, pp. 61-62. In this example, total nuclear DNA was isolated, restricted, and inserted into a plasmid. Applicant reports that 40,000 – 50,000 clones were obtained.

Example 2, Analysis of Selected Clones, pp. 62-66. 1% of the clones from Ex. 1 were evaluated.

Example 3: Identification of target sequences of Estrogen Receptor (ER), pp. 66-67; and

Example 4: Analysis of Drug Effects, pp. 67-68. DNA from estrogen treated and untreated cells were hybridized to regDNA chips. The composition, source and manner of making the chips are not disclosed.

None of the examples is directed to the identification of nucleic acid molecules that correspond to accessible regions of cellular chromatin and are isolated based on their altered reactivity to probe of chromatin structure, and which are each individually isolated and bound to a distinct address on a solid support.

It is further noted that none of the examples teach how the claimed array is to be used in a method that has utility. While the elected invention is drawn to an array and not to a method of use, the specification must still enable the making and use of the invention. In the present case, the specification has not been found to do either. The situation at hand is analogous to that in *Genentech v. Novo Nordisk A/S* 42 USPQ2d 1001. As set forth in the decision of the Court:

“[T]o be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue

experimentation.' *In re Wright* 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *see also Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharms. Co.*, 927 F. 2d 1200, 1212, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1026 (Fed Cir. 1991); *In re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) ('[T]he scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art.').

"Patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. *See Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966) (stating, in context of the utility requirement, that 'a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.') Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. While every aspect of a generic claim certainly need not have been carried out by an inventor, or exemplified in the specification, reasonable detail must be provided in order to enable members of the public to understand and carry out the invention.

"It is true . . . that a specification need not disclose what is well known in the art. *See, e.g., Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1385, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986). However, that general, oft-repeated statement is merely a rule of supplementation, not a substitute for a basic enabling disclosure. It means that the omission of minor details does not cause a specification to fail to meet the enablement requirement. However, when there is no disclosure of any specific starting material or any of the conditions under which a process can be carried out, undue experimentation is required; there is a failure to meet the enablement requirement that cannot be rectified by asserting that all the disclosure related to the process is within the skill of the art. It is the specification, not the knowledge of one skilled in the art, that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute adequate enablement. This specification provides only a starting point, a direction for further research. (Emphasis added)

The nature of the invention and the breadth of the claims

The invention relates generally to arrays of nucleic acids where each nucleotide sequence is located at a distinct address on a solid support. The nucleic acids are characterized in that,

they correspond to accessible regions of cellular chromatin and are isolated based on an unspecified altered reactivity to probing of chromatin structure.

The members of the array can be of virtually any length, and at any density.

The array fairly encompasses nucleic acids that are derived from any life form.

The state of the prior art and the predictability or unpredictability of the art

The art to which the invention relates, *i.e.*, nucleic acid array art and hybridization art, has advanced to the point that certain problematic areas have been identified. In support of this position as it relates to the manufacture and use of oligonucleotide arrays, US Patent 6,077,674 (Schleifer et al.) addresses certain highly problematic areas:

While *in situ* synthesis is a very flexible means for producing DNA arrays, the fidelity or percentage of full-length oligonucleotides synthesized within a feature on the array is less than 100 percent. An ideal array will have only full-length oligonucleotides attached to each feature. The ideal array promotes accuracy in hybridization experiments or assays or target biological materials. If the fidelity of an *in situ* generated array is less than 100 percent, it typically has non full-length oligonucleotides within a feature that usually consists of shorter lengths of the correct sequence, and to a lesser degree, incorrect sequences. Typical DNA coupling efficiencies are around 97 to 99 percent for the standard phosphoramidite chemistry. For oligonucleotides that are 25 nucleotides in length, these efficiencies result in only 46 to 77 percent full-length oligonucleotides contained within a feature (0.97^{25} to 0.99^{25}). This loss of fidelity can cause chemical noise in hybridization conditions. The loss of fidelity can also lead to difficulty in interpreting the data.

Photolithography is a method used by Affymetrix in California to produce *in situ* arrays using procedures that are similar to those used in the semi-conductor industry. In procedure described by Fodor et al. from Affymetrix U.S. Pat. No. 5,405,783, a photo-deprotection step is used where the protecting group on the phosphoramidite is removed by exposing a photosensitive protecting group to light. Four photo masks are used to create patterns to de-protect areas of the substrate and then a nucleotide is added to these regions. This technique requires four masks for each layer of nucleotides. While this technique allows for the production of high-density oligonucleotide arrays, it is less efficient than traditional phosphoramidite synthesis chemistry. With efficiencies of about 90 to 95 percent, the percentage of full-length oligonucleotides within a feature is further

reduced to about 9 to 27 percent for oligonucleotides that are 25 nucleotides long (0.90^{25} to 0.95^{25}).

At column 40 of Jones (US Patent 5,858,671) the inherent obstacle in synthesizing oligonucleotide arrays is disclosed. As stated therein, “that even if the constituent enzymatic steps approach 100% completion, incompletely processed products can accumulate to significant levels. For example, during oligonucleotide synthesis of a 70-mer, requiring 69 couplings, a 99% coupling efficiency results in only 50% of the generated oligonucleotides being full length ($0.99^{69} = 0.50$).” In the present case, applicant is claiming a product that would be the result of an infinite number of couplings, not just 69 as described above.

As noted in *In re Fisher* 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA, 1970):

In cases involving predictable factors, such as that, once imagined, other embodiments can be made without difficulty and their performance characteristics predicted by resort to known scientific laws. In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved.

17. In view of the breadth of scope claimed, the limited guidance provided, the unpredictable nature of the art to which the claimed invention is directed, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the claims are deemed to be non-enabled by the disclosure.

18. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

19. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific, substantial, and credible asserted utility or a well established utility.

20. It is noted with particularity that the claimed array is defined in terms of a product-by-process. While such claim format is permissible, the claim must still be directed to a product that has utility. However, not all nucleic acids have utility. An example of such are expressed sequence tags (ESTs) for which no known utility exists. The claimed array does not differentiate between those nucleic acids that do and do not have utility.

21. Acknowledgement is made of where applicant has provided a listing of potential utilities at page 53 of the specification. Such asserted utilities are not deemed to be specific to the members of the array.

22. It matters not whether the claim is drawn to a product or process; the claim must be drawn to an invention that satisfies the utility requirements as set forth under 35 USC 101 and as further developed in the Utility Guidelines. In support of this position, attention is directed to

Brenner, Comr. Pats. v. Manson, 148 USPQ 689 (US Sup Ct 1966):

Whatever weight is attached to the value of encouraging disclosure and of inhibiting secrecy, we believe a more compelling consideration is that a process patent in the chemical field, which has not been developed and pointed to the degree of specific utility, creates a monopoly of knowledge which should be granted only if clearly commanded by the statute. Until the process claim has been reduced to production of a product shown to be useful, the metes and bounds of that monopoly are not capable of precise delineation. It may engross a vast, unknown, and perhaps unknowable area. Such a patent may confer power to block off whole areas of scientific development, 22 without compensating benefit to the public. The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility. Unless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field.

* * *

We find absolutely no warrant for the proposition that although Congress intended that no patent be granted on a chemical compound whose sole "utility" consists of its potential role as an object of use-testing, a different set of rules was meant to apply to the process which yielded the unpatentable product. 24 That proposition seems to us little more than an attempt to evade the impact of the rules which concededly govern patentability of the product itself.

This is not to say that we mean to disparage the importance of contributions to the fund of scientific information short of the invention of something "useful," or that we are blind to the prospect that what now seems without "use" may tomorrow command the grateful attention of the public. But a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.

23. Claims 2-5 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific, substantial and credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

24. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

25. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

26. The term "accessible regions" in claim 2 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "accessible regions" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Acknowledgement is made of the specification providing a definition of the terms at page 12. Said definition, however, is

exemplary and not binding. Accordingly, the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be readily determined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

27. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

28. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,153,379 (Caskey et al.).

29. For purposes of examination, the expression “accessible regions of cellular chromatin” has been construed as encompassing not only naturally-occurring chromosomes, but also artificial chromosomes. Further, the aspect of what constitutes “accessible regions” has been construed as encompassing virtually any portion of the chromosome. While page 12 of the specification does provide a definition, said definition is general in terms and not binding. Accordingly, the polynucleotide sequences on the array can be from virtually any source, of any nucleotide composition, including artificial polynucleotide sequences.

30. Caskey et al., column 4, penultimate paragraph, teach that arrays of oligonucleotide primers can be synthesized and that the oligonucleotide primers can range from ‘about 7 to about 30 nucleotides” in length.

31. Caskey et al., column 4, last paragraph, bridging to column 5, first paragraph, teach, "The array includes oligonucleotide primers comprising all possible N-mers." Such a showing is deemed to meet a limitation of each of claims 2-5.
32. For the above reasons, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,153,379 (Caskey et al.).

Conclusion

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0751. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.
34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Schultz can be reached on (571) 272-0763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
35. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bradley L. Sisson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634